

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

BROOKE CARDOZA, et al.,
Plaintiff(s),
vs.
BLOOMIN' BRANDS, INC., et al.,
Defendant(s). }
} Case No. 2:13-cv-01820-JAD-NJK
}
} ORDER
}
} (Docket No. 364)
}

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' renewed request to have their motion to compel or for clarification heard on an expedited basis. Docket No. 364.¹ Based on the new showing made, the Court will hear the pending motion on an expedited basis. Any response to the motion must be filed no later than October 7, 2015, and any reply must be filed no later than October 9, 2015.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 2, 2015

NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Plaintiffs appear to blame the Court for their previous failure to comply with the local rules or make the required showing for emergency treatment of their motion. *See, e.g., id.* at 3 (suggesting that the Court is not “willing to step in on an expedited basis to resolve discovery disputes”). It is the duty of litigants to follow the local rules and meet applicable standards. It is not the duty of the Court to make their arguments for them, and the undersigned will not do so. *See Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D. Nev. 2013); *see also Williams v. Eastside Lumberyard & Supply Co., Inc.*, 190 F. Supp. 2d 1104, 1114 (S.D. Ill. 2001) (“A judge is the impartial umpire of legal battles, not plaintiffs’ attorney. [She] is neither required to hunt down arguments plaintiffs keep camouflaged, nor required to address perfunctory and undeveloped arguments” (internal citations omitted)).